

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/306,510

Applicant(s)

SHCROTT ET AL.

Examiner

Vernal U Brown

Art Unit

2635

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Vernal U Brown *VB*

(3) Sean McGinn *SM*

(2) Micael Horabik

(4) Fred Zimmerman *FZ*

Date of Interview: 27 March 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 2, 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Schrott.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

discussion focus on disabling the gate instead of the tag. Applicant made the point that Schrott does not teach disabling the gate. rather teaches disabling the compute device the tag is associated with. Examiner will further consider such discussion upon formal entry of amendment.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

[Signature]
Examiner's signature, if required